



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

CONTRACTS—BY-LAW OF CORPORATION—RESTRAINT OF COMPETITION.—Plaintiff corporation was formed by the farmers of Wray, Colorado, as stockholders, for the purpose of buying and selling their grain. A by-law of the company provides "the stockholders of this company may sell grain to competitors in Wray only, by paying to the secretary of the Wray Farmers' Grain Co., the sum of one cent per bushel for each bushel of grain sold, as his proportional share of the maintenance of the company". Under this by-law plaintiff sued defendant, a stockholder, for \$35 for 3,500 bushels sold to plaintiff's competitor in Wray. *Held*, the by-law (which the court considered as a contract) was illegal because in restraint of competition. *Burns v. Wray Farmers' Grain Co.* (Colo., 1918), 176 Pac. 487.

By holding the above by-law illegal the court destroyed the effectiveness of this corporation which was a combination in restraint of trade. Similarly, combinations of this nature were invalidated in two Iowa cases on which the court in the instant case relied. *Reeves v. Decorah Farmers' Cooperative Society*, 160 Ia. 194; and *Ludovese v. Farmers' Mutual Cooperative Co.*, 164 Ia. 197. In the cases of *Slaughter v. Thacker Coal & Coke Co.*, 55 W. Va. 642, and *Pocahontas Coke Co. v. C. & C. Co.*, 60 W. Va. 508, contracts between the corporations and their members aimed to accomplish the same result as the by-law in the instant case; and they likewise were held illegal. Therefore, attempts to enforce such a combination either by contract or by-law appear to be futile. Combinations like that in the instant case are unlawful because they aim to confer the power to control prices. Neither avowed purposes of public service. *Detroit Salt Co. v. Nat. Salt Co.*, 134 Mich. 120; *Pocahontas Coke Co. v. C. & C. Co.*, 60 W. Va. 508; *Morris Run Coal Co. v. Barclay Coal Co.*, 68 Pa. 173; *Judd v. Harrington*, 139 N. Y. 105, nor is the actual accomplishment of results conducive to the public welfare sufficient to make them valid. 20 AM. & ENG. ENC. LAW 849; *Anheuser-Busch Brew. Assoc. v. Houck*, 27 S. W. 692; *People v. Sheldon*, 139 N. Y. 251.

COURTS—JURISDICTION OVER FOREIGN CORPORATIONS DOING BUSINESS IN THE STATE.—The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company had no railroad lines in Texas, and had no state permit to do business in the state. It did, however, maintain an office in Amarillo, Texas, near the border, from which the general manager of its Western lines, with the aid of a trainmaster, general foreman, mechanical superintendent, and a clerical force, directed the operation of its lines outside the state. *Held*, that the railway company was not doing business within the state so as to subject it to personal service of state process. *Atkinson, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co. v. Weeks* (U. S. Cir. Ct. of App., 5th Cir., 1918), 254 Fed. 513.

The case is of value as another application of the rule that "in order to render a corporation amenable to the service of process in a foreign jurisdiction, it must appear that the corporation is transacting business in that district to such an extent as to subject it to the jurisdiction and laws thereof".—*St. Louis Southwestern Ry. Co. v. Alexander*, 227 U. S. 218, 226. No rule more definite than this has been stated, and "each case of this kind must de-